



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/238,375 01/27/99 GROOTERS

B 98-0674

EXAMINER

LM02/0921

SEAN PATRICK SUITER
SUITER & ASSOCIATES
11516 NICHOLAS STREET
SUITE 205
OMAHA NE 68154-4409

LUU, S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2773

DATE MAILED:

09/21/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

<p align="center">Office Action Summary</p>	Application No. 09/238,375	Applicant(s) GROOTERS, BRANDON A.	
	Examiner Sy D Luu	Art Unit 2773	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 July 2000.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been:
1. ☐ received.
2. ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code / Serial Number) _____.
3. ☐ received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. & 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 15) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 18) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 16) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 19) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 17) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 20) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to amendment A, filed 7/5/2000.
2. Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 6, 11 and 16 are independent claims. In the amendment, filed on 7/5/2000, claims 1, 6, 11 and 16 were amended. This action is made Final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action
4. Claims 1-11, 13-16 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Douma et al. ("Douma", U.S. # 5,990,884).

As per claim 1, Douma teaches a system for generating a device user interface executable by an information handling system, comprising: a processor (fig. 5, elements 10 and 52/52'; col. 6, lines 51-57) for executing instructions on the information handling system and a memory coupled to said processor for storing instructions for execution by said processor; a device database including listing available user interface components (col. 4, lines 59-65); a resource database including the user interface components (col. 6, lines 57-61); a user interface generator for determining whether the device is included in said device database and for retrieving the user interface components for that device from said resource database without requiring user intervention, and a layout manager for assembling the user interface components

retrieved by said user interface generator into a user interface executable by the information handling system to control the device (col. 7, lines 13-30; col. 6, lines 45-61).

Douma's system is implemented with the resource database being separate databases which are stored individually in each device rather than a single database containing resources of all device. However, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use any one of the two options depending on the implementation method. The end results would be equivalent to providing the necessary device information to the processor in generating the proper interface specific to the requested device.

As per claim 2, Douma discloses the device to be a multimedia device controlled by the information handling system (fig. 5, elements 16 and 18).

As per claims 3 and 4, by disclosing a automatic "two-way" communication method between multimedia devices and the controlling system, Douma indicates/suggests that the device and resource databases are created without requiring user intervention (col. 6, lines 45-61).

As per claim 5, Douma teaches the user interface components of said resource database comprise discrete objects (fig. 5, elements 136, 138, 140, 142).

Claims 6-10 are similar in scope to claims 1-5, and therefore are rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 11 and 13-14 combined are similar in scope to claim 1, and therefore are rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 15 is similar in scope to claim 5, and therefore is rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 16 and 18-20 are similar in scope to claims 11 and 13-15 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

5. Claims 12 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Douma et al. ("Douma", U.S. # 5,990,884) in view of Naughton et al. ("Naughton", US # 6,020,881).

As per claim 12, Douma teaches all claim limitations as applied to claim 11, but fails to teach the step of selecting generic device user interface components in the event the device is not listed in the database. Naughton teaches a method for controlling devices using an intuitive GUI. Wherein a generic user interface program object is used when a device is not available in the database (col. 30, lines 10-32). Therefore, it would have been obvious for an artisan at the time of the invention to combine Naughton's teaching with Douma's system in order to provide users a closest alternative device user interface components when the specific device is not available in the database.

Claim 17 is similar in scope to claim 12, and therefore is rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 7/5/2000 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that: (a) Douma does not teach a resource database including the user interface components where the resource database is stored separately from the device; (b) Douma's system requires user intervention to access the device interface specifications, and to create device and resource databases.

The examiner disagrees for the following reasons:

Per (a), using a centralized resource database for holding device interface data is well known in the art as disclosed by Douma (col. 1, lines 22-26). As pointed out by the examiner in the rejection above, the use of such a database in a distributed or centralized manner is a detail implementation which would have been an obvious implementation option, depending on the design consideration, to an artisan at the time of the invention.

Per (b), as disclosed by Douma (col. 6, lines 45-61; and col. 7, lines 13-30), Douma's required user intervention is only for the determination of a device to be selected, but not for the process of accessing the device interface specifications, nor for the creation of the device/resource databases as claimed.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Responses

8. Responses to this action should be mailed to:

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231.**

If applicant desires to fax a response, (703) 308-9051(52) may be used for formal communications or (703) 308-6606 for informal or draft communications.

Please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT" for informal facsimile communications. For after final responses, please label "AFTER FINAL" or "EXPEDITED PROCEDURE" on the document.

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).


Inquires

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Sy D. Luu** whose telephone number is (703) 305-0409. The examiner can normally be reached on **Monday - Thursday from 6:30 am to 4:00 pm**. The examiner can also be reached on alternate **Friday**.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Matt Kim**, can be reached on (703) 305-3821.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3800.

Sy D. Luu
Patent Examiner
September 15, 2000
sdl


**RAYMOND J. BAVERL
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2773**